

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/843,946	CARLSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa M Caputo	2876	

All Participants:

(1) Lisa M Caputo.

(2) George Likourezos (Reg. No. 40,067).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 January 2005

Time: 1 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

n/a

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


MICHAEL G. LEE
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Lisa Caputo contacted attorney of record Samuel Miller (Reg. No. 27,360) of Burns, Doane, Swecker and Mathis on January 18, 2005 to check the status of the case since a reply was overdue. Mr. Miller put the examiner in contact with Aaron Bernstein (Reg. No. 36,745), the Director of IP at Symbol Technology who was going to check on the status of the case. On January 19, 2005, the examiner received a call from George Likourezos (Reg. No. 40,067) regarding the case 09/834,946. Upon returning the call, the examiner pointed out that the case in question was 09/843,946. Mr. Likourezos indicated that a reply had been filed in error to the case 09/834,946, not the correct case 09/843,946. Mr. Likourezos faxed the examiner a copy of the reply, with the incorrect number crossed out and the correct number written beside it on January 19, 2005. After consultation with the supervisor, Mr. Michael Lee, the case has abandoned status since a timely reply was not filed. Examiner alerted attorney that the case is abandoned and that a petition would be necessary to revive the case. .